JAN 3 1 2005 ∞ Please type a plus sign (+) inside this box \rightarrow +

DAN

PTO/SB/21 (08-00)

Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paper Reduction Act of 1995, r	o persons are required	to respond to a collection of infor	mation unless it displays a valid OMB control number					
TRANSMITT	AL	Application Number	10/791,694					
FORM		Filing Date	March 2, 2004					
(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)		First Named Inventor	David R. Zittel					
		Group Art Unit	1761					
		Examiner Name	George C. Yeung					
Total Number of Pages in This Su	bmission 9	Attorney Docket Number						
	ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)							
Fee Transmittal Form		ment Papers Application)	After Allowance Communication to Group					
Fee Attached	Formal	Drawings [Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences					
Amendment /Reply	Amendment /Reply Licensin		Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)					
After Final	Petition	[Proprietary Information					
Affidavits/declaration(s)		to Convert to a anal Application	Status Letter					
Extension of Time Request	Change Address	of Correspondence [Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):					
Express Abandonment Request	Statuto	ry Disclaimer						
Information Disclosure Statement	Reques	st for Refund						
Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)	CD Nu							
Response to Notification of Missing Requirements Under 35 USC 371	Remarks							
Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 DECLARATION								
SIGNA	TURE OF APPLI	CANT, ATTORNEY, OR A	GENT					
Firm David D. Ste		ion No. 40,828						
or Boyle, Fredrickson, Newholm, Stein & Gratz, S.C.								
Customer No.: 23598								
Signature Sti								
Date January 26, 2005								
CERTIFICATE OF MAILING								
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on this date: January 26, 2005								
Type or printed nameDawn M. Oleszak								
Signature That on	M. Oles	sak Date	January 26, 2005					

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.2 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time your are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.

Dawn M. Oleszak

Dawn M. Oleszak

Date: January 26, 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s): David R. Zittel et al Docket No.: 338.071

Serial No.: 10/791,694 Filed: March 2, 2004

Reissue of.: U.S. Pat. 6,214,400 Issued: April 10, 2001

Examiner: George C. Yeung Group Art Unit: 1761

Title: Method for Processing Food Product

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In this Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement, patentee wishes to make record the blueprint of Hughes Company dated June 16, 1997 submitted herewith that was enclosed with a letter dated February 12, 2003 from Hughes' patent attorney, a copy of which is also enclosed. As is noted in the attached letter, Hughes' contends the blancher shown in its 1997 blueprint is prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) due to its commercial installation and use Listowel, Canada in 1997. The Angy blancher discussed in the letter refers to a current Hughes blancher design that Hughes contends is based on the 1997 blancher. Other than that, the Hughes/Angy blancher is not believed to be prior art and has not been included.

Page 2 of the enclosed Hughes' February 12, 2003 letter states that the 1997 Hughes' blancher has a single water recirculation pipe with discharge nozzles mounted

S.N. 10/791,694 Art Unit: 1761

beneath the blancher's rotating perforate drum. The letter states that the 1997 Hughes' blancher also has two steam pipes to provide heated steam to the water in the blancher over the length of the blancher.

From the Hughes 1997 blancher blueprint, it appears that the water recirculation pipe, labeled "Water Recirculation Manifold" in the Hughes 1997 blancher blueprint, has a length that is less than about one-third the total length of the blancher. One steam pipe, labeled "Steam Manifold" in the Hughes 1997 blancher blueprint, appears to have a length that extends from one end of the blancher to about the halfway point of the blancher and the other steam pipe appears to have a length that extends from the opposite end of the blancher to about the halfway point of the blancher.

No other parameters, including operating parameters, have been provided by Hughes. However, Hughes stated in its letter that the current Hughes/Angy blancher design is very similar to the Hughes 1997 blancher. Assuming that to be the case, it appears that the single water recirculation pipe of the Hughes 1997 blancher is somewhere around 55 inches long and made of 2 inch tubing or piping having ½ inch to ¾ inch discharge nozzle openings spaced about 2 inches apart from each other. If the same or similar 5 horsepower pump was used as in the Hughes/Angy blancher design, it is roughly estimated that a water flow rate out each discharge nozzle would be approximately somewhere around 2-4 gpm at a pressure of somewhere around 5-15 psi. It may be possible to increase output pressure somewhat by constricting flow out each discharge nozzle, but this would reduce the water flow rate to something less than the aforementioned 2-4 gpm estimate.

The steam flow rate(s) and steam pressure(s) are not known for the 1997 Hughes blancher or the Hughes/Angy blancher.

Page 3 of the enclosed Hughes February 12, 2003 letter asserts that De Back, U.S. Patent No. 2,299,088 (actually U.S. Patent No. 2,299,080) is prior art to the claimed invention. It should be noted that De Back's more comprehensive parent, U.S. Patent No. 2,314,871, was considered by the Examiner during the prosecution of patentee's U.S. Patent No. 6,234,066, which is a continuation of patentee's U.S. Patent No. 6,214,400, which is the

S.N. 10/791,694 Art Unit: 1761

subject of the above-identified reissue application. It also should be noted that patentee's '066 patent is also currently under reissue. Copies of both De Back patents are being submitted herewith in this information disclosure statement.

In addition, the patentee wishes to supplement and clarify the record regarding a prior art commercial blancher installation of the patentee, the general parameters of which are summarized and disclosed at col. 1, line 62-65 of the Background of the Invention section of patentee's '400 patent. Further analysis of the operating parameters of this prior art commercial blancher installation of the patentee indicates that a 7½ horsepower pump was used to pump water through a water recirculation header having a length of about 53 inches. The water recirculation header was equipped with twenty-one discharge nozzles that each had an opening 1/8 inch in diameter and that were spaced apart from each other between about 2 and 3 inches. The water pressure in the water recirculation header was estimated to be somewhere between 42-48 psi, which is higher than the 8 psi stated in the aforementioned Background of the Invention section of patentee's '400 patent. However, the water flow rate out each discharge nozzle of the water recirculation header is estimated to have been somewhere around 1-2 gpm, which is lower than the 10 gpm stated in the Background of the Invention section of patentee's '400 patent.

S.N. 10/791,694 Art Unit: 1761

While neither the 1997 Hughes blancher, the De Back patents, nor the patentee's own prior art blancher are believed to be material to the patentability to the invention claimed in the '400 patent or to any of the presently pending claims in the above-identified application, the Examiner is nonetheless requested to take all of this into careful consideration in examining the above-identified application. If the Examiner needs additional information that might be helpful in making this determination, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

David D. Stein

Reg. No. 40,828

Boyle, Fredrickson, Newholm, Stein & Gratz, S.C. 250 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1030 Milwaukee, WI 53202

Phone: (414) 225-9755 Fax: (414) 225-9753

Customer No.: 23598



U.S. Department of Commerce Patent and Trademark Office

Atty. Docket No. Appln. No. 10/791,694 338.071 Applicant David R. Zittel et al Group Art Unit Filing Date

1761

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT

(Use several sheets if necessary)

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS						
EXAMINER INITIAL	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
	2,299,080	10/20/42	De Back	426	509	
	2,314,871	3/30/43	De Back	134	65	
						· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
					:	

March 2, 2004

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS							
	DOCUMEN	NT T				TRANSI	LATION
	NUMBER	R DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	YES	NO
-							

	OTHER REFERENCES (Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.)
	Blueprint of Hughes blancher dated June 16, 1997 of 1997 its blancher installation at Campbell Soup's factory in Listowel, Canada

*EXAMINER	DATE CONSIDERED		

*Examiner: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication with client.